

ORGANISED LABOUR AND EUROPE: AN INVESTIGATION  
OF BRITISH AND SCOTTISH PERSPECTIVES

R Graham and M McGrath

Introduction

Frances Fukuyama's essay *The End of History* startled the academic world and pleased a few cold warriors in its assertion that the "Red Menace" was on its last legs. Fukuyama got it wrong, of course, as Cairns Craig among others has argued<sup>(1)</sup>. Even if the world is not yet the global village of McLuhan's invention, there is a real sense in which Scotland and the UK have been shaken into realisation that the process of European transformation and realignment is likely to affect us dramatically in the near future. Fukuyama's latter day Hegelianistic vision of ultimate virtue residing in the economic and political formations of capitalist democracy is as at odds with the confusion of current events in Eastern and Western Europe as it is with the potential richness and diversity promised by the re-emergence of Europe as a politically self-conscious entity. And yet Fukuyama has articulated a growing belief on the part of those who see in the events of this latter portion of the 20th century the permanence of bourgeois political democracy and its perceived self-sustaining adaptability in the midst of momentous changes in the international sphere. With world power politics shifting away from the Soviet-US axis and the economic might of Japan showing signs of waning, social forces within European nation states are becoming increasingly aware of the necessity to keep up with an accelerating pace of change.

In Britain the reaction of the main political parties and of trade unions to the post-war development of Europe from the Treaty of Rome in 1961 to the point of Britain's entry to the European Community has been characterised by ambivalence. Trade Unions, the TUC and STUC in particular, with which this essay is principally concerned, have displayed a schizophrenia of character reflecting and, to an extent, caused by the ambiguity of the relationship of organised labour to capitalism<sup>(2)</sup>. The British labour movement's attitude to Europe in general and to the European Communities in particular has been conditioned in the recent past by the advent of Thatcherism, the resultant restructuring of the social, political and economic agenda along with the related process of realignment within the Labour Party itself. Beyond such pragmatic concerns there is evidence that the trade union movement, particularly in Scotland, is now embracing a European perspective for its own sake – the Tories discomfiture at the candid remarks of Nicholas Ridley simply adding piquancy to the equation that it is labour, politically and industrially, which is now fast becoming the party for Europhiles with the Conservatives exposed as "Little Englanders" at best and Xenophobes, at worst; that the

growth of international capitalism can only be challenged successfully by an internationalism of labour and its organisations; that, in fact, given the progressive social force embodied in the STUC and the nature of Scottish society, the end of history prescribed by Fukuyama will be denied by the development of democratic socialism in a devolved or independent Scotland.

### British Labour and Europe

The British trade union and labour movement is often portrayed as insular and chauvinistic; holding to the view that intellectual speculation is futile and that foreigners start at Calais. Reading like an identikit of the top range of *Sun* readers, this is nonetheless a powerful image of trade unionists' attitude to Europe as perceived by large sections of the British population. Or, at least as British labour is portrayed on this issue in the majority of instances in which it gains media attention. This represents only a partial truth. While British labour has not always embraced Europe as an opportunity to advance its cause and while all elements of its still considerable number may not be absolutely convinced, the foregoing negative image can be seen as a construction grounded on the particular nature of the trade union and labour movement response to Europe characteristic of the 1970s.

The earliest official utterance of the TUC on the question of Britain's membership of the "European Common Market", while declaring that it was inadvisable that Britain should join, nevertheless conceded that should "relative prosperity and competitiveness suffer through exclusion, a rethink would be necessary"<sup>(3)</sup>. Such ambiguity in the face of a contentious issue of public policy is typical of the TUC: it might not be in favour of the idea but that doesn't necessarily mean it is against it. Yet the question of membership concerns the very essence of Britain's economic, political and social structures well into the 21st century. Encapsulated in the stilted discourse of TUC deliberations are questions of the United Kingdom's relationship to the rest of the world and, for Scotland, to the rest of Britain as well as to the world beyond. Although such issues have yet to emerge clearly within trade union circles the issue is more finely focussed in Scotland in the 1990s: the debate is about notions of nationality; about social, economic and political formations within and straddling nation states and sub-nations like Scotland, striving for that status.

The confusion of British labour – political and industrial – towards European integration while markedly diminished by the early '90s has deep and diverse roots. Thus, for instance, Hugh Gaitskell's apocalyptic pronouncement conveyed by the Labour leader to the 1962 Conference that membership of the EEC would mean "the end of Britain...(and)...the end of one thousand years of history"<sup>(4)</sup>, is counterposed to Isaac Deutscher's vision of six years later that "by about the turn of the century something like a United States of Socialist Europe will exist"<sup>(5)</sup>. Gaitskell's rhetoric may border on the bizarre – what can have happened in the mid-10th century from which he

begins his chronology and the "thousand years of history"? – and Deutscher's verging on the fantastic, but the point is that they, in the company of many others are commenting on truly momentous historical changes<sup>(6)</sup>, nothing less than the potential realignment of post-war world power politics. The place of organised labour within that process of change is by no means clear although a cynic might observe that just as the clock that is stopped is right twice every twenty-four hours, the British trade union movement must have adopted the correct stance at some time (however that is to be evaluated) since it has been for, against and neutral in its attitude to Europe over the past forty years.

### TUC and STUC

A schematic chronology of the shared attitudes of the TUC and STUC towards Britain's membership of the European Economic Community can be represented as follows. In the 1950s, general hostility; in the 1960s positive acceptance; in the 1970s, outright hostility; in the early 1980s, agnosticism followed, later in that decade by acceptance, bordering on a muted enthusiasm. While the present condition of cautious enthusiasm may be attributed, in no small measure, to the politics of exclusion visited on the trade union movement by the present government, this is not a sufficient explanation. Motions to TUC and STUC congresses calling for Britain's withdrawal from Europe, once passed "on the nod", are now noticeable by their absence. Such is the extent of this change that the Furniture Timber and Allied Trades Union (FTATU) withdrew such a motion to the 1989 STUC Conference on being informed that the General Council would oppose. In UK terms the movement's attitude was crystallised in Ron Todd's memorable utterance that "the only card game in town is in a town called Brussels" delivered at the 1988 TUC Conference<sup>(7)</sup>.

It is possible to view the STUC's history with regard to Europe as mirroring that of the British TUC. In a sense, since all the unions which are affiliated to the STUC are also affiliated to the TUC, they too are enjoined in attitudes and postures struck by that organisation from the 1950s. Were it that simple. The STUC is a national trade union confederation without a nation state or anything approaching that with which to relate. Despite, or perhaps because of this, the STUC approach to Europe and the world has been somewhat different from the conservative pragmatism displayed by its neighbour in Congress House. The STUC too has been pragmatic but it is a pragmatism informed by a political perspective which has seen it reap the financial and other benefits offered by the EC and adopt a critical posture when that has been deemed necessary. This is most clearly seen in relation to STUC educational provision on Europe, dealt with later. Moreover, unlike the TUC the STUC has consistently embraced an internationalist perspective which has included Europe and extended far beyond: but the Europe of the STUC is not that of the TUC. The formation of the World Federation of Trade Unions in the immediate post-war period, in which the TUC played a major part, was quickly followed by the latter's *volte face*, when, along with (and at

the likely instigation of) American labour the Cold War produced the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU)<sup>(8)</sup>. Despite this and the events in Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968 – instances which simply confirmed the TUC in its alignment in the Cold War – the STUC has continuously cultivated links with labour organisations in what, until very recently, were called the “Socialist countries”. Running parallel to the political and trade union perspectives conditioning this position with regard to Eastern Europe the STUC, while not dropping its hostility to the capital dominated imperative driving the European Communities engine, has nevertheless worked assiduously within EC structures in the interests of the Scottish economy<sup>(9)</sup>.

After a period of hostility covering many years, when it was said that Vic Feather, TUC General Secretary regarded the STUC as “a glorified Trades Council”, the two organisations now work together in reasonable unanimity. Yet, as Scotland seems on the point of gaining some form of independence within the UK this unity may well be under threat. Indeed, the breach which caused the secession of a number of Scottish Unions from the TUC in 1885 to establish the STUC has never been satisfactorily addressed and never remedied<sup>(10)</sup>. The STUC as an independent trade union centre represents a duplication of the TUC in a Scottish context since both bodies have their own affiliates, funds and policies. While the TUC works well with the STUC on Scottish issues, the former accords no *de jure* validation to the STUC’s international links. The STUC does gain *de facto* access to European Community structures but only by virtue of the STUC General Secretary’s nomination by the TUC to the European Communities Economic and Social Committee.

The implications of the Single European Market (SEM) for the Scottish economy are liable to be profound given the geography of Europe coupled to the long-term decline of the Scottish manufacturing base. The prospect of a Scottish parliament with direct input to Europe entails a radical rethink of the STUC’s status as a national trade union centre both within and outwith the United Kingdom. The need for the STUC to continue, develop and extend its campaigning role is greater now than ever. In this context the major part played by the STUC in the formation of the International Trade Unions Committee for Peace and Disarmament (the Dublin Committee) is worthy of mention, bringing together the rival international trade union centres, the ICFTU and WFTU.

The similarities in terms of the role, nature and function of the STUC and TUC serve also to focus important differences. These are not only located in the breadth and catholicity of the STUC’s international links and its more dynamic campaigning role. Important differences exist in terms of the basis of affiliates’ representation at annual conference and in the centrality of the Scottish Trades’ Councils to the work of the STUC. In all of this the location of the STUC within Scottish politics and Scottish society is different in kind from

that of the TUC in its relationship to England and Wales. This is partly a consequence of the size of the Scottish population which permits the STUC a more central role as a social formation denied the much larger TUC in relation to England and Wales. It is also a consequence of the political and social role which the STUC has created for itself over the years. The challenge of the SEM coupled with the prospect of devolution or even independence represents a profound challenge for the STUC, Scottish unions and the labour movement in this country.

### TUC and STUC: Education and Europe

There is a formulation long in currency amongst trade union educators which can be expressed as follows. Education for members, lay representatives and officials is important, but not as important as policy formation and its translation into trade union action. The former notwithstanding, the formulation continues: if an issue is too difficult to be approached, never mind solved, the best option is to address it through educational provision. Thus, for instance, low levels of membership involvement has been a focus of trade union concern and of educational provision for some time now. Having decided, finally, that Britain’s entry into Europe is a reality and, given ten plus years of evangelical conservatism with the uncertain prospect of more to come, the trade union movement has decided that, all things considered, the EC might just be a “good thing”. What to do in the face of this realisation has been to see the solution in terms of educational provision, in consonance with the aforementioned adage.

The nature and type of this provision varies from union to union and it differs between the STUC and TUC responses. Finally coming to terms with this issue meant, for the TUC, the publication of a document entitled, *Maximising the Benefits: Minimising the Costs*.<sup>(12)</sup> In the best traditions of TUC education the perspective advanced has been one of opportunistic pragmatism. Thus, workplace representatives should effectively forget about debating the macro-economic and political issues and concentrate on ensuring that representatives and membership are aware of the bargaining issues so that employers can be encouraged to prepare for the increased competition of the SEM and jobs protected. Partly because the TUC’s educational provision is writ large in Scotland combined with the STUC’s scant resources in this area, the majority of Scottish trade unionists engaging in educational provision do so through that provided by the TUC largely through Colleges of Further Education. The STUC approach is somewhat different.

The EC sponsored Community Education for Training and Technology (COMETT) secured £45,000 for the STUC, an amount roughly matching its Scottish Education Department grant. Aimed at equipping Scottish unions with expertise on the organisational and related uses of new technology this ongoing project is proving very successful. In contrast the £30,000 received by the TUC for similar purposes represents a miniscule proportion of its c.£2m of

central government funding for education and training programmes<sup>(13)</sup>. If the STUC is more reliant and proportionately much more successful than its counterpart in Congress House at attracting European money for this purpose it is because of Scotland's regional status which aided the STUC's application coupled with its chronic shortage of funds.

The disparity of educational funding between TUC and STUC, even accounting for Scotland's smaller population, is replicated in the wider picture. The issue of finance is one which is likely to become a source of difficulty for the STUC in the near future and one which could bring it into open conflict with the TUC. Scottish trade unionists effectively pay for two trade union centres: just under 50p per year goes from each Scottish trade unionist to the STUC while a figure approaching £1 goes to the TUC. Whereas the TUC finances the Wales TUC and English Regional TUCs, the STUC is not in receipt of such monies, despite significant need. As the likely establishment of a Scottish parliament will cause a redefinition of the STUC's role and relationship to the TUC, it is likely that questions of finance and funding will be of more immediate moment than issues of status between STUC and TUC.

The STUC cannot match the TUC in services to member unions nor would it claim to even try. However, in those elements of educational provision dealing with Europe, with 1992 and the SEM, the STUC displays a hard critical edge lacking in TUC provision. While seeking, like the TUC to "maximise the benefits", STUC provision allows for deployment of ideas and debate on larger ideologically grounded issues. This reflects a finely focussed and long running debate within the TUC education service itself concerning the nature and purpose of trade union education which can only be mentioned in passing.

In the context of STUC provision it is signalled by such events as the large scale, high profile conference entitled "Scotland and 1992" held in 1989 which included MPs, MEPs, COSLA representatives along with senior full-time and lay union officials. The Scottish region of the TUC has mounted such events, but these have been characterised by the instrumental approach referred to earlier. This critical but positive approach on the part of the STUC extends beyond the educational sphere as evidenced by, for instance, the rigorous analysis of the contribution of the European Regional Development Fund and the European Social Fund to the Scottish economy and the part played by trade unions in this process<sup>(14)</sup>.

#### **Scottish Unions and Education for Europe: An Indicative Survey of Lay Official Perceptions.**

Most unions in line with TUC and STUC decisions – FTATU notwithstanding – have now accepted both the permanence of British membership of the European Communities and the less than likely prospect of

any renegotiation of the terms of membership. Virtually all unions have welcomed the emergence of "social Europe" in the form of the European Social Charter. As Martin Kettle puts it: "If any one event can be said to have changed the British left from European agnostics into European enthusiasts then it was Jacques Delors' speech to the 1988 TUC at Bournemouth"<sup>(15)</sup>. The fact of Mrs Thatcher's repugnance of the Delors' proposals on this as on other issues simply adds to the piquancy of union enthusiasm for this aspect of European development.

Rather than mechanically assess the preparedness of Scottish unions to 1992 and related issues it was felt more useful to identify the perception of key lay activists in this regard. The survey to which the following conclusions relate is not advanced as a representative sample but as indicative of a general disposition on the part of lay union activists on the question of the EC<sup>(16)</sup>. More particularly the survey has a four-fold importance. Firstly, it sought to identify respondents' perception (as distinct from whatever the reality might comprise) of their union's preparedness for 1992 and the SEM. Secondly, respondents were invited to identify their own needs and those of their members in the light of 1992 and, coupled with this, how best these needs could and should be serviced. Finally, respondents' attitudes to the importance of certain key issues like foreign language training was investigated.

An overwhelming majority (71%) felt that Europe was the single most important issue for British trade unions, the remainder being evenly divided between those who accorded it "some importance" and "not sure". There was a massive majority on the part of respondents to become involved in some form of activity in anticipation of the SEM. Thus, 85% said they would study a foreign language, given the opportunity: French, German, Spanish, Italian and Russian being prioritised in descending order of preference with one respondent expressing a desire to learn Albanian! From this result it comes as no surprise to learn that over 70% felt that foreign language training should be a priority for trade union education. A similar percentage stated that their union had a policy on Europe and 1992, the enthusiasm for foreign language training and the priority accorded 1992 perhaps indicating that where unions have adopted a positive attitude on this issue, union officials are likely to respond in kind. This had been a relatively recent development, however, with 57% of respondents claiming their union had adopted a policy as recently as 1989 with only 14% locating the policy decision any earlier: in 1988 to be precise. The remainder indicated uncertainty.

On the issue of research, education and publicity the perception of respondents was that their union had not done all it might. Under 30% claimed their union had commissioned research into the impact of 1992 on their industry or sector while only one in three stated their union had a national officer responsible for Europe and 1992 related matters. Again under 30% had attended educational provision provided by their union on Europe and 1992 but this increases to a very respectable 64% when other providers like

theTUC, STUC and Edinburgh and Lothians 1992 Committee are included.

It is easy to be seduced by such a response. As those responding were to an extent self-selecting (in that they chose to return the survey) it may be that the education addicts are over-represented. Given the low proportion of representatives who take up TU educational provision it is likely that the former is, indeed, the case<sup>(17)</sup>. In addition, there is a tendency in such surveys that when participants are invited to be critical of their union, it is an opportunity many cannot resist. Nevertheless, a massive 78% felt they received inadequate information from their union on this issue.

The kind of information respondents wished to receive is, in descending order of preference, health, safety and the environment; the social charter, working conditions and employment law followed by sectoral/industrial information. Also gaining mention were equal opportunities, minimum wage regulations, cooperation with European unions, qualifications, training and joint management-union approaches to industrial relations. The preferred method of receiving the information identified above was predominantly educational with 70% of the sample requesting seminars, short courses and guest speakers. This was combined with nearly 60%<sup>(18)</sup> mentioning union, TUC or STUC newsletters or bulletins on these issues.

While it is acknowledged that such a relatively small survey can make no firm claims from statistical outcomes, the results invite certain tentative conclusions. These are, that the majority of senior lay activists feel that membership of the EC or the prospect of 1992 is important enough for their unions and, judging by the demand for language training and for information, themselves to take very seriously. Indeed, after a long and troubled history of hostility, and ambivalence towards Europe on the part of the trades unions, STUC and TUC acceptance of membership seems now to be enthusiastically anticipated by union activists.

### Scottish Trade Unions and Devolution

The most significant event on the political horizon for Scottish people and their trade unions is the prospect of a Scottish parliament, located in Edinburgh. As Western Europe along, possibly, with some Eastern European states, moves steadily towards economic and political union so the counter tendency of national self-assertion appears as a contradictory, if understandable, development. Commenting on this Tom Nairn argues, (contrary to Eric Hobsbawm in *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780*, with whom he explicitly disagrees) that a positive reformulation of Europe in 1992 and beyond is actually dependent on the strengthening of national identity and the national state, mediated by the extension of democracy<sup>(19)</sup>.

Scotland's claim to some form of national self-determination is well known if, to date, it has been short on success. The STUC view on this matter is

unequivocal. The General Council's preference is for a directly elected Scottish parliament within the UK envisaged as the pre-figuration of assemblies for Wales and the English regions. A UK financial base would be charged with attending to matters such as defence, foreign affairs and agreed over-arching economic responsibilities. The January-March issue of the *STUC Review* contains an extensive and quite detailed exposition on the General Council's position on this and on the issues of the Scottish parliament's structure, its relationships with Westminster and Europe as well as its views on financial and other powers; on electoral reform and the representation of women at (Scottish) parliamentary level. Oddly, there is no mention of the STUC or of the projected role of Scottish unions with regard to a Scottish parliament. This is all the more surprising given the leading campaigning role undertaken by the STUC, on behalf of Scottish industry and the Scottish people, in relation to such issues as coal and steel.

The role and function of the STUC within a Scotland governed by its own parliament is of central importance. As Martin Kettle has argued, small states are right to fear the massive federalist structures of a European super-state since size will determine levels of representation and, therefore, the extent of purchase in terms of decision making<sup>(20)</sup>. There is no escaping the fact that in the process of European integration geography has dealt Scotland a poor hand: perched on the European, outer periphery with the central conglomeration of consumers located many hundreds of miles to the South. Moreover, the land-route to that market involves English transport infrastructures which is one reason why the SNP's claim for "Independence within Europe" is a flawed concept: what price would an English state extract from a sovereign Scottish state for the privilege of using this infrastructure? The answer might be: no more than any other European state. To which it is possible to counter that a Tory dominated England (as it would almost certainly be, without the Scottish Labour contingent at Westminster) would be unlikely to go out of its way to assist the economic development of its nearest (Labour dominated) competitor. In this respect Scotland needs the rest of the UK and the rest of the UK needs Scotland.

Given the prospect of devolution the relationship of Scotland to the rest of the UK raises analogous but more focussed questions for the STUC and Scottish unions. This issue has received scant attention in the debates accompanying the establishment of the Constitutional Convention. It is clear that an elected assembly with any real power would have to make decisions within economic, political and social spheres. The implications for the internal organisation of Scottish unions, for their relationship to national (UK) organisations; and for the STUC's relationship with the Scottish parliament, to Westminster and the TUC are of real consequence.

Local and national economic planning of the kind possible in a country the size of Scotland entails the necessary ability to make and enforce agreements involving the state (both local and national), capital and labour. It is not

impossible to foresee a situation in which Scottish unions could arrive at agreements with indigenous capital or local authority employers when the demands of solidarity with less successful counterparts could invite unity of action in terms of national – i.e. UK – trade union perspectives. Such a situation could clearly work in reverse, with Scottish unions in dispute with public or private sector employers while Southern unions had settled. Such conflicts of interest and loyalty are not new to trade unionism, nor are specific Scottish and English deals unknown. The prospect of this developing from the exception to the norm would, however, comprise a difference in degree amounting to a difference in kind. The impact on UK trade union structures can only be guessed.

Even accepting the ultimate incompatibility of employer and trade union aims, consider the problems which would emerge if devolution of power within union organisations – from a UK to a Scottish level – does not complement political devolution. Thus, if a Scottish Assembly develops economic initiatives which demand a planned approach to investment and growth coupled with the aim of redistributing wealth not only through the wage packet but through a variety of non-wage benefits, success would depend on close collaboration, if not a formal compact, with organised labour. If agreement on planning is essential to a national deployment of national resources then a collision course with the proponents of “free collective bargaining”, possibly within Scotland but certainly outwith it, is possible.

If the Scottish unions along with the STUC – which, for the past ten years has acted as a powerful anti-Tory focus in the mobilisation of Scotland's economic interests – are to claim their rightful place of influence in a devolved Scotland the potential for conflict with even a Labour-controlled Westminster and with non-Scottish trade unions and the TUC has to be acknowledged. Considerable strain could well be placed on internal union loyalties were decisions taken by Scottish unions, mindful of their central role in post-Thatcher Scotland, to conflict with nationally agreed policies. The relationship between the STUC, its member unions and a Labour-dominated Assembly is unlikely to be smooth. But given the centrality of trade unionism and the STUC to Scottish labour, and Labour's historic ties to the organised working class, the prospects for a period of real social, economic and cultural progress appears brighter than anything south of the Border.

## Conclusion

There is no reason, in logic, why Fukuyama's claim that the political forms of capitalist democracy could not come to represent a permanent state of historical stasis. For all but those few still retaining an absolutist belief in the driving force of economic determinism to undermine capitalism, Fukuyama's formulation can and should be challenged by the interplay of economic base and the active political, cultural and ideological endeavours of individuals and organisations. It was Len Murray, then TUC General Secretary, who sought

to locate the industrial role of labour organisations under capitalism, when he said that: “We cannot talk as if the trade union movement is some form of alternative government, Brother Bonnie Prince Charlie waiting to be summoned back from exile”.<sup>(22)</sup> Murray was, of course, attempting to exorcise the ghost of the perceived militancy of trade unions in the 1970s which it was held had lost Labour the 1979 General Election and the memory of which had contributed to the 1983 defeat. Beyond this contingent motivation Murray's assertion has to be carefully considered in the Scottish situation.

The STUC could never, nor should it, represent itself as an alternative government in Scotland – given the baneful legacy of Jacobite romanticism it would be doomed from the outset by any association with the “Bonnie Prince”. Yet there is a sense in which Scottish trade unions, through the STUC, could have a powerful influence in the shaping of Scottish society. Already committed to some form of proportional representation for election to a Scottish parliament the STUC could be a formidable force for the extension of democratic participation by the Scottish people in constructing a future which calls into question Fukuyama's attempted legitimisation of capitalist democracy as the zenith of human social achievement. The STUC will be assisted in this by the much more outward-looking perspectives adopted by trade unions and their members towards issues like the environment; the position of women, young people and racial minorities in society; the importance of non-wage benefits to those outwith structures of employment and much more besides. The STUC has to consider this now

The STUC could and must consider itself a social as well as industrial formation, using its still considerable membership – there are 830,000 trade unionists in Scotland out of a working population of c.2 million – to help construct popular democratic forums engaging participation at every level. No other social formation comes even close to the ability of the STUC to act as the coordinating body of a network of organisations reaching, through trade union membership, into most homes in Scotland. Helping build labour consciousness to that stage upon which political consciousness can be developed is no easy task. Yet if the centripetal tendencies inherent in the current process of European integration are to be countered and the benefits utilised for the producers of wealth, their families and communities then the enthusiasm of lay union activists, as indicated by the survey results, has to be encouraged and serviced.

Until the cataclysm of 1914-18 the period from the 1890s witnessed the growth of unparalleled working class and labour radicalism. A century later the cause of labour is just as urgent; just as valid. Scottish labour – its political and industrial wings – and the Scottish people stand on the verge of a future promising much. We may not yet be on the way to Deutscher's united socialist Europe, but if the STUC can provide the lead of which it is capable, Scotland may, in the not too distant future, capture the prize of a real, participative socialist democracy and so contribute to the realisation of that vision in

Europe.

Robert Graham, lecturer in Trade Union Studies, Stevenson College, Edinburgh.

Mick McGrath, Head of Management and Labour Studies, Stevenson College, Edinburgh.

#### References

1. Cairns Craig, "Where Are We in History?", *Radical Scotland*, No.42, Dec.89/Jan.90.
2. See, for instance, Perry Anderson's discursive essay, "The Limitations and Possibilities of Trade Union Action", T Clarke and L Clements, (eds.) *Trade Unions under Capitalism*, London, 1977.
3. Cited by P Teague, "Labour and Europe: The Response of British Trade Unions to Membership of the European Community", unpublished Ph.D thesis, University of London, 1984.
4. Hugh Gaitskell, quoted by P Williams, *Hugh Gaitskell*, Oxford, 1982, p.296.
5. Isaac Deutscher, "Germany and Marxism" *New Left Review*, No.47, Jan-Feb, 1968.
6. On the labour movement's response to Europe - particularly the left - Tom Nairn, *The Left Against Europe*, Aylesbury, 1973, p.xi and passim, argues "that deep division on the left was inevitable, either sooner or later, since it represented a **major historical change**" (emphasis added). It is instructive to note that the tenor of Tony Benn's reluctant acceptance of Britain's membership was conditioned as much by the negative impulse of his anti-Americanism as it was by the attractions of Europe. See, Benn *Out of the Wilderness - Diaries 1963-1967*, London, 1988, p.204 and passim. Richard Crossman, *Diaries of a Cabinet Minister*, London, 1975, Vol.1, pp.335-6 candidly reveals that in 1967 entry to Europe was necessary because "the socialist insular offshore island solution we could still have had after the 1966 election is now desperately dangerous to attempt".
7. *TUC Report* 1988, p.572.
8. One recently retired Scottish trade union leader asserts, without the hint of a smile, that the TUC affiliation fee to the ICFTU is met by the British Foreign Office.
9. The struggle to save Ravenscraig is a case in point where the lobbying is in Brussels not London. It is hoped that European competition policy might assist if the suspected link between British Steel's intention to close Ravenscraig can be exposed as a fix designed to gain access to the European markets arranged with a major European steel producer.
10. See Angela Tuckett, *The Scottish Trades Union Congress*, Edinburgh, 1986, pp.19-25.
11. Andrew Scott, et al, *Completing the Internal Market: Some Implications for the Scottish Economy*, Edinburgh, 1988 undertakes a sectoral analysis of the Scottish manufacturing base.
12. *TUC Maximising the Benefits: Minimising the Costs*, 1988.
13. The STUC has recently secured a further £146,000 over three years for the continuation of its technology training, gained from the EC because of Scotland's regional status.
14. Malcolm Burns, *EEC Structural Funds in Scotland*, Glasgow, 1988.
15. Martin Kettle, "Ignorance is Bliss", *Marxism Today*, Dec.1989. The TUC passed a motion at the 1989 Conference welcoming the Social Charter.
16. Thirty-four senior lay representatives from thirteen unions in the Edinburgh and

Lothians responded to a twenty item survey: NALGO (Gas and Edinburgh District Council), CPSA, UCATT, IRSF, NUCPS, TGWU, MSF, USDAW, SOGAT, IPMS, NUPE, COHSE, EIS (CLA).

17. *TUC Report*, 1988. There are approximately 130,000 lay trade union officials at any one time. Of these, in 1987/88 9,500 received some TUC educational provision.
18. Some respondents identified more than one method.
19. Tom Nairn, "Beyond Big Brother", *New Statesman*, June 15, 1990.
20. Kettle, Martin, "Head over Heels", *op cit*, June 1990.
21. For a fuller discussion see, R Graham and M J McGrath, "Trade Unions and Devolution", *STUC Review*, No.44, Autumn, 1989.
22. *TUC Report*, 1984.